



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/551,591 | 09/30/2005 | Ertugrul Bayour | PHDL0997-001 | 1181 |
| 26948 | 7590 | 01/05/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| VENABLE, CAMPILLO, LOGAN & MEANEY, P.C. 1938 E. OSBORN RD PHOENIX, AZ 85016-7234 | | | HAWK, NOAH CHANDLER | |
| | | ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | | 3636 |
| SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 3 MONTHS | | 01/05/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/551,591 | BAYOUR, ERTUGRUL | |
| | Examiner Noah C. Hawk | Art Unit 3636 | |
| <i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</i> Period for Reply | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. | | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | |
| Status | | | |
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____. 2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is FINAL . 2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final. 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-3</u> is/are rejected. 7) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>4-26</u> is/are objected to. 8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | |
| Application Papers | | | |
| 9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| 12) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of: 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____. 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | |
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. | |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application | |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/16/06</u> . | | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. | |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 4-26 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from another multiple dependent claim. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.
2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: the label "(4)" is used to describe both the handle and the body while the label "(6)" is used inappropriately after the word "handle" in line 3. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van der Hoven in US Patent 5934499 in view of Sigmond in US Patent 636760. van der Hoven teaches a setup comprising an umbrella (best seen in Figure 1) having a handle (11) supporting the umbrella with a body (6) through which the handle passes inside which is a safe (the locking box is considered sufficiently safe-like). Van der Hoven fails to teach that the safe is electronic and includes a control panel, command accessories and an independent source of power. Sigmond teaches an electronic safe having a control panel (12a) and

command accessories (42a') as well as an independent source of power (42b) located inside the body. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the safe of van der Hoven by using an electronic safe with a control panel, command accessories and an independent source of power as taught by Sigmond in order to provide a more easily operable safe than a stand lock-and-key safe.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over van der Hoven in view of Sigmond as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Valdner in US Patent 5349975. van der Hoven, as modified, fails to teach a solar collector located on the umbrella to obtain power. Valdner teaches an umbrella 24) having solar collectors (38) mounted thereon to obtain power required to charge batteries (44) and operate accessories. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the umbrella of van der Hoven, as modified, by adding a solar collector on the umbrella in order to provide a free, renewable source of energy for the safe mounted on the umbrella.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Peterson and Chang disclose umbrellas with solar collectors. Biondi et al., Robinson and Boyce disclose umbrellas with safes.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Noah C. Hawk whose telephone number is 571-272-1480. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Dunn can be reached on 571-272-6670. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NCH
NCH
12/14/06


DAVID R. DUNN
PRIMARY EXAMINER